DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 249 691 EC 170 492

AUTHOR Hill, B. K.; And Others
TITLE Stability of Residential Facilities for Mentally Retarded People: 1977-1982. Brief #22.
INSTITUTION Minnesota Univ., Minneapolis. Dept. of Educational Psychology.
SPONS AGENCY Health Care Financing Administration (DHHS), Washington, DC.
PUB DATE Jun 84
GRANT DHHS-18-P-98078/5-01
NOTE 27p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Community Programs; Followup Studies; *Mental Retardation; National Surveys; Residential Institutions; *Residential Programs

ABSTRACT

Residential facilities for mentally retarded people surveyed in a national study in 1977 were re-contacted in a 1982 replication of the earlier survey. Among facilities surveyed in 1977, 61.6% were found to still be open at the same address in 1982 (did not close, move, or stop serving mentally retarded clients). Stability rates varied considerably among states, types of facilities and sizes of facilities. A low rate of stability among semi-independent living programs was seen to be in large measure a reflection of the lifestyle these programs seek to emulate. Similarly, the high stability of the largest facilities reflected the amount of capital invested in their physical plants and equipment. It was concluded that efforts, including facility certification and increased financial rewards for care provision, should be made to build the level of commitment and support for community-based facilities. (CL)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

ED249691

Center for Residential and Community Services

Stability of Residential Facilities for Mentally Retarded People: 1977-1982

Brief #22 June, 1984

EC170492

Department of Educational Psychology
University of Minnesota

The Center for Residential and Community Services in the Department of Educational Psychology at the University of Minnesota, formerly the Developmental Disabilities Project on Residential Services and Community Adjustment, has been a primary source of data on residential services for developmentally disabled people in recent years. The purpose of the Center is to collect and disseminate comprehensive information on residential facilities for handicapped people and develop policy analysis including: (a) administrative, financial and personnel data and issues, (b) demographic, behavioral, physical and health characteristics of residents, (c) programs and activities provided to residents, and (d) resident movement.

Center for Residential and Community Services
University of Minnesota
207 Pattee Hall
150 Pillsbury Drive, S.E.
Mineapolis, Minesota 55455

The University of Minnesota is committed to the policy that all persons shall have equal access to its programs, facilities, and employment without regard to race, creed, color, sex, national origin, or handicap.

The recommended citation for this paper is: Hill, B. K., Bruininks, R. H., Lakin, K. C., Hauber, F. A., & McGuire, S. P. (1984). Stability of Mental Retardation Facilities for Mentally Retarded People: 1977-1982 (Brief No. 22). Minneapolis: Center for Residential and Community Services, University of Minnesota, Department of Educational Psychology.

Stability of Residential Facilities
for Mentally Retarded People: 1977-1982

Brief #22 June, 1984

This research is supported by a grant (18-P-98078/5-01) from the Health Care Financing Administration, Department of Health and Human Services. Contractors undertaking such projects under government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their professional judgment in the conduct of the project. Points of view or opinions stated do not, therefore, necessarily represent the official position of the Health Care Financing Administration.

EC170492

Abstract

Residential facilities for mentally retarded people surveyed in a national study in 1977 were re-contacted in a 1982 replication of the earlier survey. Among facilities surveyed in 1977, 61.6% were found to still be open at the same address in 1982 (did not close, move, or stop serving mentally retarded clients). Stability rates varied considerably among states, types of facilities and sizes of facilities.

Several studies have reported the year in which residential facilities for mentally retarded people opened. In 1977, 71% of 1,973 specialized foster homes, 56% of 4,427 community residential facilities and 17% of 263 state institutions reported opening at their present site within the previous 4.5 years (Bruininks, Hill, & Thorsheim, 1982). In 1982, 47% of 6,587 specialized foster homes, 52% of 8,634 community residences, and 9% of 412 public facilities (16 or more residents) reported opening at their present site within the previous 4.5 years (Center for Residential and Community Services, 1983). These statistics seem to indicate a rapid growth in the number of residential facilities. However, no data have been available on the complementary rate at which facilities close or move.

In recent years there has been growing concern among parents and advocates regarding the stability of community-based residential facilities (Bradley, 1981). Studies of parental reservations and resistance to movement of their offspring from public institutions to community-based settings find a concern for placement stability to be one of the most frequently cited reasons for not wanting to end institutional placement (Conroy, in press; Keating, Conroy & Walker, 1980).

While resident movement is common in public and private facilities (e.g., 14.4% of all residents were admitted to their current placement between July 1, 1981 and June 30, 1982), it has generally been assumed that resident movement is based on decisions about appropriate placement of the persons going from one setting to another. Previously there have been no data on the extent to which facility movement and closure contribute to resident movement. Nor have there been data on the extent to which parents' concerns for placement stability are justified. This paper presents national data on the stability of residential facilities.

Method

In 1977 the Center for Community and Residential Services (CRCS) surveyed 6,661 residential facilities (Bruininks, Hauber & Kudla, 1980; Bruininks, Hill & Thorsheim, 1980) that met the following definition:

> Any living quarter(s) which provides 24-hour, 7 days-a-week responsibility for room, board, and supervision of mentally retarded people as of June 30, 1977, with the exception of: (a) single family homes providing services to a relative; (b) nursing homes, boarding homes, and foster homes that are not formally state licensed or contracted as mental retardation service providers; and (c) independent living (apartment) programs which have no staff residing in the same facility.

A parallel national survey was undertaken on June 30, 1982. In both surveys a comprehensive registry (mailing list) of facilities was constructed with assistance from all appropriate state and regional licensing and program agencies and, when necessary, with the help of individual provider agencies. Attempts were made to verify the accuracy and completeness of each state's registry by returning it to a designated key contact person for review. Facilities were assigned a unique identification number for data analysis, but street addresses were used as a means of tracking and avoiding duplication.

In May, 1982, postcards were sent to 4,997 facilities that had been open on June 30, 1977 asking if they still served mentally retarded people at the same address. The status of 1,128 New York foster homes was provided by the New York Office of Mental Retardation/Developmental Disabilities (NYOMRDD) and 262 public institutions were reviewed by Richard Scheerenberger of the National Association of Superintendents of Public Residential Facilities for the Mentally Retarded. About 4% (276) of the 6,663 1977 facilities could not be included because complete street addresses were not available. Post cards returned by the post office, the addressee, or NYOMRDD confirmed that 1,314 facilities were closed or had moved. The remaining 3,073 addresses, including 843 for which no postcard was returned, were merged with the 1982 national

registry; 2,663 duplicate 1982 addresses were removed.

Questionnaires were mailed to all facilities in the registry in September, 1982. The initial mailing was followed in two weeks by a reminder postcard, in four weeks by a second copy of the questionnaire, and finally by telephone follow-up on all nonrespondents and to facilities that had returned questionnaires with incomplete or inconsistent information. Facilities serving mentally retarded clients on June 30, 1977 who no longer did as of June 30, 1982 were considered closed. So, too, were several facilities that no longer provided full-time supervision as part of their program. Facilities that indicated a change of address were contacted by telephone to determine whether the residence had moved or whether the change was only in mailing address (e.g., use of administration office address or changes in street name, post office box, or route). This process involved use of telephone directory assistance, state and county agencies, and the central offices of provider agencies to confirm the exact status of facilities that could not otherwise be located.

As part of the 1982 survey, a taxonomy of facility types was developed to permit uniform classification of facilities across states. This classification involved asking respondents to indicate which one of the following was the best description of their facility:

- A home or apartment owned or rented by a family, with one or more retarded people living as family members (e.g., foster home)
- A residence with staff who provide care, supervision and training of one or more mentally retarded people (e.g., group residence)
- A residence consisting of semi-independent units or apartments with staff living in a separate unit in the same building (e.g., semi-independent living)
- A residence which provides sleeping rooms and meals, but no regular care or supervision of residents (e.g., boarding home)

- A residence in which staff provide help with dressing, bathing or other personal care, but no formal training or residents (e.g., personal care home)
- A nursing home (e.g., ICF or SNF, or facility with nursing emphasis)

Comparison of 1977 and 1982 survey data required reclassification of the 48 licensing codes recorded in the 1977 survey into the 6 facility "types" used in 1982. It was assumed that facilities still open at the same address after 5 years had not changed types; these facilities (3,925) were assigned the "type" indicated on their 1982 questionnaires. On a state-by-state basis, if at least 95% of the facilities with the same 1977 licensing code indicated the same 1982 "type," then all 1977 facilities with that code were assigned the generally agreed upon 1982 type; this procedure assigned 1,377 facilities to a 1982 type. The remaining 1,361 1977 questionnaires were assigned a type based upon individual examination of the original protocol.

Stability rates were computed within each state and nationally for each of six facility types. Facilities of each type were further divided into quartiles based on size (total number of residents). To accommodate the skew in size distribution of group residences, the quartile of the largest group residences was further subdivided into three size categories.

Results

It was possible to follow-up on 6,340 of the 6,663 facilities surveyed in 1977 (276 questionnaires had incomplete addresses, 47 were duplicates, had been filled out only for part of a facility, or had been filled out for several facilities at separate sites). Of the 6,340 facilities (214,586 residents), 61.6% of the facilities (92.2% of residents) continued to operate at the same address over the five year period (3,906 facilities with 197,896 residents were still in operation at the same address in 1982).

Table 1 reports rates of stability by type and size of facility. These rates are reported as the proportion of facilities in each group that continued to serve mentally retarded residents at the same address from 1977 to 1982, and as the proportion of mentally retarded residents that resided in these "stable" facilities. The proportion of stable beds was consistently larger than the proportion of stable facilities because, even within a single size category, larger facilities tended to be more stable, and because only a small proportion of beds in some facilities (e.g., boarding homes) were for mentally retarded residents. Appendix A includes state-by-state breakdowns of closure/movement data.

Semi-independent living programs were the least stable type of residential placement, with only 39.7% remaining open at the same address over 5 years. Large group residences and large specialized nursing facilities were the most stable. Stability rates for group residences with 64-499 residents and group residences with 500 or more residents were 90.4% and 98.4%, respectively. Specially licensed nursing facilities with 53-100 residents and 101 or more residents had stability rates of 81.8% and 91.3% respectively. Foster homes, which were second only to group residences in number of facilities and residents, were considerably less stable than group residences primarily because they were smaller. For example, the stability rates of foster homes of 3-4 residents (mean=3.4) was 52.7%, compared with a rate of 58.6% for group residences of 6 or fewer residents (mean=4.5). Large foster homes (5 or more residents) had a stability rate of 68.3%, as compared with a rate of 68.8% for group residences of 7-9 residents.

With respect to the concerns about stability in residential placement that were noted early in this paper, some comparative statistics are informative. For example, during 1982 the probability of a resident moving

Table 1
Rates of Stability of Residential Facilities for Mentally Retarded People during a Five Year Period (June 1977 - June 1982)

Type	Facilities			MR residents			
	Size	N	Stability	N	Mean	SD	Stability
Foster homes							
	1	698	36.7%	698	1.0	.0	36.7%
	2	506	48.8%	990	2.0	.2	48.9%
	3-4	788	52.7%	2,645	3.4	.7	53.2%
	5+	501	68.3%	2,819	5.6	2.0	69.5%
			50.5%				57.4%
Group resid.							
	1-6	840	58.6%	3,792	4.5	1.5	62.3%
	7-9	767	68.8%	5,793	7.6	1.5	70.1%
	10-18	781	70.6%	8,659	11.1	4.0	72.5%
	19-63	417	75.1%	11,412	27.5	15.4	81.2%
	64-499	251	90.4%	42,482	169.9	111.6	94.2%
	500+	126	98.4%	125,496	981.5	527.7	99.3%
			70.2%				94.4%
Semi-independent							
	1-3	34	8.8%	74	2.2	.6	12.2%
	4-7	34	44.1%	198	5.8	1.5	44.9%
	8-12	36	50.0%	336	9.3	1.8	51.5%
	13+	32	56.2%	649	20.3	12.6	60.4%
			39.7%				52.7%
Board & room							
	1-5	26	61.5%	66	2.5	1.3	66.7%
	6-10	28	64.3%	167	6.0	2.4	71.3%
	11-19	27	66.7%	207	7.7	5.5	78.3%
	20+	27	48.1%	533	19.7	17.1	53.5%
			60.2%				62.7%
Personal care							
	1-4	82	68.3%	214	2.6	1.2	68.7%
	5-11	84	73.8%	479	5.7	2.7	73.3%
	12-23	85	64.7%	718	8.4	5.8	62.0%
	24+	79	57.0%	1,494	18.9	19.3	64.2%
			66.1%				65.5%
Spec. nursing							
	1-29	22	81.8%	324	14.7	8.8	87.3%
	30-52	24	70.8%	836	34.5	14.3	72.2%
	53-100	22	81.8%	1,369	61.1	28.4	82.3%
	100+	23	91.3%	2,141	93.1	51.2	93.5%
			81.3%				86.0%
All types			61.6%				92.2%

from a public institution with 16 or more residents because of release (11.4%) or facility instability (0.5%) was only somewhat less than the chance of leaving a foster home (7.9% release and 8.8% instability). And while foster homes have a somewhat higher instability rate (8.8% in 1982) than group homes with 15 or fewer residents (5.8% in 1982), because of lower release rates, 7.9% and 14% respectively, the probability of an individual resident moving was somewhat less in foster homes than in group homes.

The growth in the number of smaller facilities in recent years has largely been an effort to provide mentally retarded people with experiences more normal than those provided by institutions. Therefore, it is interesting to compare the stability of small residential facilities with the stability of the "natural households" that they are attempting to emulate. Table 2 presents a comparison of 1980 U.S. Census data on household moves among the general population and household moves among foster homes and small residential facilities (all types, 1-15 residents). As shown, the rate of instability among small facilities was actually somewhat less than the rate of household movement for the general population. Of course, among the general population these household changes do not usually cause dissolution of the family unit, whereas in many cases residents in mental retardation facilities are split up when a facility moves or closes.

Except for "size" and "type of facility," an examination of resident and facility characteristics did not show consistent differences between stable and unstable facilities. Table 3 presents data on two facility groups that are each relatively homogeneous: foster homes with 1-4 residents and private group residences with 6-64 residents. Independent variables including type of ownership, years in operation, residents' level of retardation, residents' age, geographic location, percent of residents with parental visits, staffing

Table 2
Comparison of all Households and Mental Retardation Facilities (1-15 residents) Movement/Closure: 1977-1982

State	Household Living Units N	Moved	Residential Facility N studied	Closed/ moved
Alabama	1,341,856	46.7%	13	84.6%
Alaska	131,463	75.4%	2	50.0%
Arizona	957,032	65.6%	16	31.3%
Arkansas	816,065	52.4%	12	25.0%
California	8,629,866	59.3%	665	39.8%
Colorado	1,061,249	63.1%	60	41.7%
Connecticut	1,093,678	46.5%	35	14.3%
Delaware	207,081	46.7%	2	.0
Dist. Columbia	253,143	48.1%	1	100.0%
Florida	3,744,254	57.2%	169	45.0%
Georgia	1,871,652	51.4%	29	34.5%
Hawaii	294,052	55.8%	64	34.4%
Idaho	324,107	58.3%	12	33.3%
Illinois	4,045,374	49.0%	31	61.3%
Indiana	1,927,050	49.0%	33	39.4%
Iowa	1,053,033	48.5%	26	11.5%
Kansas	872,239	52.6%	87	51.7%
Kentucky	1,263,355	50.2%	11	72.7%
Louisiana	1,411,788	49.9%	8	25.0%
Maine	395,184	46.7%	29	24.1%
Maryland	1,460,865	50.4%	17	41.2%
Massachusetts	2,032,717	45.2%	132	31.8%
Michigan	3,195,213	49.1%	628	37.3%
Minnesota	1,445,222	51.5%	125	8.0%
Mississippi	827,169	45.8%	5	60.0%
Missouri	1,793,399	49.4%	264	46.2%
Montana	283,742	58.1%	59	32.2%
Nebraska	571,400	50.7%	85	42.4%
Nevada	304,327	70.3%	23	69.6%
New Hampshire	323,493	51.9%	15	53.3%
New Jersey	2,548,594	44.0%	117	51.3%
New Mexico	441,466	59.0%	30	46.7%
New York	6,340,429	43.9%	1,238	47.7%
North Carolina	2,043,291	47.2%	66	27.3%
North Dakota	227,664	52.9%	9	66.7%
Ohio	3,833,828	48.7%	226	38.5%
Oklahoma	1,118,561	53.8%	1	.0
Oregon	991,593	61.5%	42	42.9%
Pennsylvania	4,219,606	39.3%	282	48.9%
Rhode Island	338,590	44.80	10	30.0%
South Carolina	1,029,981	47.0%	20	40.0%
South Dakota	242,523	51.8%	17	64.7%
Tennessee	1,618,505	50.0%	77	48.1%
Texas	4,929,267	57.0%	50	60.0%
Utah	448,603	58.0%	17	70.6%
Vermont	178,325	49.7%	60	53.3%
Virginia	1,863,073	52.8%	42	50.0%
Washington	1,540,510	59.5%	47	31.9%
West Virginia	686,311	44.2%	9	33.3%
Wisconsin	1,652,261	48.5%	111	27.9%
Wyoming	165,624	64.7%	9	55.6%
U.S. Total	80,389,673	51.1%	5,138	42.1%

Note. Household movement data covers 63 months (1-1-75 to 4-1-80). Source: U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census (1982). Provisional Estimates of Social, Economic, and Housing Characteristics (Report No. PHC80-S1-1). Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 3
Selected Characteristics of Facilities Studied in 1977
and Percent that Moved or Closed between 1977 and 1982

	Foster homes (1-4 residents)		Group Residences (private, 6-63 residents)	
Characteristic	N	Close/Move	N	Close/Move
Operator				
Indiv/fam	2098	53.9%	640	34.8%
Profit corp.			258	24.8
Non-prof. corp.			1068	26.7
Church			65	13.9
Single facility	2098	53.9	846	29.7
Part of group			1162	28.1
At this address				
0-5 yrs.	1266	56.8	1271	27.5
6-10 yrs.	481	47.2	457	28.2
11-20 yrs.	204	50.5	196	34.7
21+ yrs.	30	46.7	66	27.3
Resident ability				
mixed	311	47.3	759	24.8
66% mild/borderline	439	56.5	437	36.2
66% moderate	526	53.8	436	27.5
66% sev/profound	500	55.0	297	24.9
Resident age				
mixed	106	44.3	253	33.2
75% 0-21 yrs old	742	53.4	392	30.4
75% 22+ yrs old	939	55.3	1331	27.1
Location				
rural	608	53.0	233	29.6
town (2500-49999)	483	55.5	417	23.7
city	462	49.6	380	24.7
Parents visit				
none	578	51.6	37	43.2
1-49% of residents	148	43.2	171	25.2
50%+ of residents	657	55.6	778	24.2
Staff pattern				
live-in	2098	53.9	561	25.7
shift			361	25.5
ICF-MR certified				
no	2098	53.9	1861	30.7
yes			174	5.8
Problems reported				
none	468	49.6	84	25.0
funding	817	53.6	636	29.4
community support	455	51.7	231	29.0
resident programs	70	62.9	146	21.2
cert/lic/paperwork	110	60.9	180	21.1

pattern, ICF-MR certification, several "management problems," size, and per diem reimbursement were regressed directly upon stability/instability. These variables in combination explained only 5.1% of the variation in the stability of foster homes and 7.4% for group residences.

Foster homes and group residences were slightly less stable if they had predominantly borderline/mildly retarded residents and if they were located outside large cities. Foster homes were less likely to be stable if they reported having problems with resident program plans, licensing requirements or "paperwork." Group residences tended to be less stable if they were operated by individuals or families, and more stable if operated by a religious organization, if they served adults, or if they were ICF-MR certified. (Note the low close/move rate among Minnesota's group residences, all of which were ICF-MRs, in Table 2.)

Discussion

Each year, approximately 7.7% of all residential facilities close or move; approximately 1.6% of all mentally retarded people in residential care are displaced for this reason. This compares with 11.5% of residents who were transferred or released for other reasons between July 1, 1981 to June 30, 1982 (Center for Residential and Community Services, 1983). The rate of facility stability is above the rate of household stability among the general population.

With respect to the differences in stability of different types of facilities certain comments should be made. First, the low rate of stability among semi-independent living programs is in large measure a reflection of the life style these programs seek to emulate. Apartment living arrangements have grown not only because they provide an arrangement particularly suitable for non-intrusive monitoring of residents, but also because they require minimal start-up costs, virtually no upkeep of the physical plant and do not tie a

program to a single residential setting should it provide unsatisfactory community experiences. Indeed, although semi-independent residential "households" tended to be less stable between 1977 and 1982 than U.S. households in general, their stability was actually considerably higher than the 1975-1980 national rate for households living in rental properties (39.7% of semi-independent residences versus 24.6% of households in rented units).

Precisely the opposite situation with respect to physical plant helps explain the high stability of the largest facilities. These facilities have large amounts of capital invested in their plants and equipment. In most states considerable amounts have been spent over the last several years to bring these facilities into compliance with ICF-MR standards. In many instances states have issued long-term bonds in order to remodel these facilities and, therefore, tend to have established long-term commitments to keeping them open. Few smaller facilities enjoy such interest on the part of the state for their survival. Since many large facilities represent a major, and often the primary, economic resource in the communities in which they operate, the support for keeping them in operation is further heightened. Nevertheless, because of efforts to continue the depopulation of institutional settings, it is notable that the estimated annual rate of displacement (movement caused by facility instability or resident discharges) of persons residing in government operated facilities with more than 15 residents was 11.9% versus 16.7% for the relatively unstable foster homes.

These rates would be even more similar had data been available on movement between living units within the multi-unit, large state institutions, or on the proportion of foster homes that closed while they were "between residents." Approximately 28% of foster homes in this study had only one resident, and doubtless many of these homes "closed" immediately after their

resident had been released, resulting in no actual displacement of residents because of facility instability.

This research does not directly respond to the basis of concern of those parents and advocates who are troubled by the instability of residential settings for mentally retarded people. An obvious limitation of this study is that it provided no opportunity to document reasons for closure of individual facilities or the planning and services provided by local agencies in managing relocation of residents and services. Such issues need careful study, particular in light of potential adverse effects of relocation (Carsrud, Carsrud, Henderson, Alisch, & Fowler, 1979; Romer & Berkson, 1980). While one can suggest that the opportunity to experience the general transience of contemporary society is a tolerable aspect of normalization, it can hardly be argued that the habilitative potential of community-based living is served by frequent, unnecessary or nonpurposeful movement of residents from one setting to another. In this regard, parents' concerns about resident transfers for reasons other than promoting habilitative and social opportunities are valid from both a humanistic and psychological perspectives. However, these valid concerns for stability must be accompanied by continued commitment to providing residential services in those settings that can meet the contemporary standards for habilitation and social integration that increased facility stability would heighten. The question that arises from this research should be how can our society build the level of commitment and support for stability in community-based facilities that presently exists for the larger institutions.

One method of increasing stability noted in the research was through ICF-MR certification. In this regard it is worth noting that during the period covered by this research (1977-1982) the number of ICF-MR certified facilities with 15 or fewer residents grew from 185 (with about 1700 residents) to 1200

(with 9,700 residents). Another way of increasing facility stability is to increase the financial rewards of providing care. This is particularly important in foster care, boarding care, personal care, and other individual or family operated residential models. Since the loss of the care provider in these care models means the loss of the facility, and since wages have a substantial relationship with care provider losses (Lakin, Bruininks, Hill, & Hauber, 1982), means must be employed to transfer the higher levels of funding generally available to staffed group residences into payment for services in the individual and family centered models. The Medicaid waiver offers one opportunity for such action (Lakin, Greenberg, Schmitz, & Hill, in press).

But, if anything, this study points to the need for more focused research on this topic. As deinstitutionalization continues and the use of small community-based settings increases, it will be ever more important to identify ways to increase the stability of these facilities.

References

Bradley, V.J. (1980). "Mental Disabilities Services: Maintenance of Public Accountability in a Privately Operated System," in J.J. Bevilacqua (ed.), Changes in Government Policies for the Mentally Disabled. Cambridge, MA: Ballinger Publishing Co.

Bruininks, R.H., Hauber, F.A., & Kudla, M.J. (1980). National survey of community residential facilities: A profile of facilities and residents in 1977. American Journal of Mental Deficiency, 84, 470-478.

Bruininks, R.H., Hill, B.K., & Thorsheim, M.J. (1982). Deinstitutionalization and foster care for mentally retarded people. Health and Social Work, 7, 198-205.

Carsrud, A.L., Carsrud, K.B., Henderson, D.P., Alisch, C.J., & Fowler, A.V. (1979). Effects of social and environmental change on institutionalized mentally retarded persons: The relocation syndrome reconsidered. American Journal of Mental Deficiency, 84, 266-272.

Center for Residential and Community Services (1983). 1982 National Census of Residential Facilities: Summary Report. (Brief No. 21). Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota, Department of Educational Psychology.

Conroy, J.W. (in press). "Reactions to Deinstitutionalization Among Parents of Retarded People," in R.H. Bruininks & K.C. Lakin (Eds.). Living and Learning in the Least Restrictive Alternative. Baltimore: Paul H. Brookes.

Keating, D.J., Conroy, J.W., & Walker, S. (1980). Family impact baselines: A survey of the families of residents of Pennhurst. (Pennhurst Study Report PC803). Philadelphia: Temple University, Developmental Disabilities Center.

Lakin, K.C., Bruininks, R.H., Doth, D., Hill, B.K., & Hauber, F.A. (1982). Sourcebook on Long-Term Care for Developmentally Disabled People. (CRCS Report No. 17). Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota, Department of Educational Psychology.

Lakin, K.C., Bruininks, R.H., Hill, B.K., Hauber, F.A. (1982) Turnover of direct-care staff in a national sample of residential facilities for mentally retarded people. American Journal on Mental Deficiency, 87(1), 64-72.

Lakin, K.C., Greenberg, J.N., Schmitz, M.P., & Hill, B.K. A comparison of Medicaid Waiver applications for mentally retarded and elderly/disabled populations. Mental Retardation, in press.

Romer, D., & Berkson, G. (1980). Social ecology of supervised communal facilities for mentally disabled adults: III Predictors of social choice. American Journal of Mental Deficiency, 85, 243-252.

APPENDII A

Tables contained in Appendix A report the number of facilities included in the CRCS five year study of stability, and the proportion of facilities and beds that moved or closed between June 30, 1977 and June 30, 1982. Stability rates cited in the text of this paper were obtained by subtracting close/move rates from 1.

Although these tables present all data, cells based upon less than 25 facilities should not be interpreted as representative of a particular state. Aggregated data should be used as estimates for small cells.

1

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table A-1

Specialized Foster Home Five Year Close/Move Rate: 1977-1982

State	Number of facilities studied by size of facility				Beds closed/moved by size of facility				Facilities closed/moved by size of facility			
	1	2	3-4	5+	1	2	3-4	5+	1	2	3-4	5+
Alabama	0	0	0	3				100.0%				100.0%
Alaska	0	0	0	0								
Arizona	0	0	0	0								
Arkansas	0	0	0	0								
California	59	64	163	182	59.3%	50.0%	47.5%	27.5%	59.3%	50.0%	48.5%	30.2%
Colorado	0	1	1	1		100.0%	.0	.0		100.0%	.0	.0
Connecticut	0	0	0	0								
Delaware	0	0	0	0								
Dist. Columbia	0	0	0	0								
Florida	17	10	25	17	70.6%	50.0%	53.6%	35.2%	70.6%	50.0%	56.0%	35.3%
Georgia	0	0	0	0								
Hawaii	2	3	24	0	100.0%	33.3%	55.6%		100.0%	33.3%	54.2%	
Idaho	0	0	1	4			.0	27.8%			.0	25.0%
Illinois	9	4	2	1	55.6%	50.0%	100.0%	100.0%	55.6%	50.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Indiana	0	0	0	0								
Iowa	0	0	0	1				.0				.0
Kansas	1	6	5	10	100.0%	83.3%	57.9%	69.0%	100.0%	83.3%	60.0%	70.0%
Kentucky	0	0	0	0								
Louisiana	0	0	0	0								
Maine	0	0	0	4				.0				.0
Maryland	0	0	0	0								
Massachusetts	0	0	0	0								
Michigan	91	83	62	76	45.1%	43.9%	52.3%	17.0%	45.1%	44.4%	51.6%	17.1%
Minnesota	0	0	2	2			100.0%	45.5%			100.0%	50.0%
Mississippi	0	0	0	0								
Missouri	53	41	29	17	64.2%	54.3%	48.9%	37.4%	64.2%	53.7%	44.8%	41.2%
Montana	0	2	4	2			42.9%	.0			50.0%	.0
Nebraska	0	0	0	0								
Nevada	6	7	4	1	83.3%	57.1%	42.9%	100.0%	83.3%	57.1%	50.0%	100.0%
New Hampshire	1	0	0	3	100.0%			31.3%	100.0%			33.3%
New Jersey	22	33	23	7	72.7%	58.7%	57.1%	2.6%	72.7%	57.6%	56.5%	14.3%
New Mexico	0	0	0	0								
New York	380	220	372	132	65.3%	52.1%	45.4%	35.1%	65.3%	52.3%	46.0%	36.4%
North Carolina	0	0	3	2			33.3%	50.0%			33.3%	50.0%
North Dakota	0	0	0	0								
Ohio	27	25	44	24	66.7%	52.0%	31.9%	35.9%	66.7%	52.0%	34.1%	37.5%
Oklahoma	0	0	0	0								
Oregon	0	1	0	2		100.0%		.0		100.0%		.0
Pennsylvania	7	10	4	0	85.7%	.0	25.0%		85.7%	.0	25.0%	
Rhode Island	0	0	0	0								
South Carolina	0	0	0	0								
South Dakota	0	0	0	0								
Tennessee	4	1	2	2	50.0%	.0	50.0%	.0	50.0%	.0	50.0%	.0
Texas	0	0	0	0								
Utah	6	5	1	0	66.7%	100.0%	100.0%		66.7%	100.0%	100.0%	
Vermont	11	7	11	5	90.9%	85.7%	42.4%	37.0%	90.9%	85.7%	45.5%	40.0%
Virginia	0	0	0	0								
Washington	0	0	0	0								
West Virginia	0	0	0	0								
Wisconsin	2	5	6	3	100.0%	.0	52.9%	75.0%	100.0%	.0	50.0%	66.7%
Wyoming	0	0	0	0								
U.S. Total	698	506	788	501	63.3%	51.1%	46.8%	30.5%	63.3%	51.2%	47.3%	31.7%
Small cells	88	60	93	111	75.0%	49.6%	52.2%	37.0%	75.0%	50.0%	52.7%	38.7%

Note. "Small cells" are totals for states with fewer than 25 facilities in a size category.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table A-2

Group Residence Five Year Close/Move Rate: 1977-1982

State	Number of facilities studied by size of facility						Beds closed/moved by size of facility					
	1-6	7-9	10-18	19-63	64-499	500+	1-6	7-9	10-18	19-63	64-499	500+
Alabama	5	5	0	2	4	1	100.0%	64.1%		.0	8.1%	.0
Alaska	2	0	1	0	1	0	33.3%		100.0%		.0	
Arizona	5	6	7	2	2	1	65.4%	18.4%	36.1%	.0	.0	.0
Arkansas	0	4	6	1	4	1		22.9%	30.4%	.0	.0	.0
California	87	5	47	50	16	9	25.4%	35.7%	25.4%	25.1%	9.5%	3.4%
Colorado	15	17	13	3	4	2	37.0%	16.7%	24.1%	.0	.0	.0
Connecticut	5	4	25	9	7	2	60.0%	.0	3.9%	15.8%	.0	.0
Delaware	1	1	1	3	0	1	.0	.0	.0	.0		.0
Dist. Columbia	1	0	0	1	0	1	100.0%			.0		.0
Florida	42	21	35	15	5	5	46.4%	52.1%	25.9%	45.7%	.0	.0
Georgia	4	19	5	3	4	2	22.7%	36.7%	38.6%	29.6%	.0	.0
Hawaii	7	0	0	1	0	1	46.2%			.0		.0
Idaho	0	1	4	3	1	0		.0	.0	.0	.0	
Illinois	3	0	8	35	26	6	22.2%		35.9%	21.5%	8.6%	11.1%
Indiana	16	9	2	3	2	4	14.9%	59.4%	33.3%	3.5%	.0	.0
Iowa	8	6	10	11	3	2	12.5%	17.8%	.0	15.6%	25.2%	.0
Kansas	26	12	19	3	7	1	44.0%	50.6%	40.1%	32.1%	.0	.0
Kentucky	6	4	1	2	6	0	80.6%	48.3%	100.0%	.0	.0	
Louisiana	0	0	8	5	12	2			26.8%	.0	.0	.0
Maine	6	0	6	6	1	0	34.5%		11.5%	31.4%	.0	
Maryland	3	8	2	4	6	1	30.0%	12.5%	.0	.0	.0	.0
Massachusetts	23	85	17	10	5	5	53.2%	20.0%	24.7%	8.8%	5.1%	.0
Michigan	49	96	186	32	9	5	25.5%	41.6%	34.3%	19.2%	9.7%	.0
Minnesota	46	25	49	27	8	4	1.5%	8.5%	10.4%	5.8%	13.4%	.0
Mississippi	1	1	3	0	5	1	100.0%	.0	57.1%		.0	.0
Missouri	47	26	36	17	10	2	40.6%	22.2%	49.0%	28.7%	16.3%	.0
Montana	14	33	4	1	1	0	50.0%	23.7%	27.8%	.0	.0	
Nebraska	38	26	17	1	3	1	40.6%	50.0%	11.2%	.0	.0	.0
Nevada	2	1	0	2	1	0	100.0%	100.0%		58.2%	.0	
New Hampshire	6	3	1	2	0	1	50.0%	69.6%	100.0%	0		.0
New Jersey	4	5	12	5	3	7	38.5%	45.5%	43.0%	20.0%	.0	.0
New Mexico	18	6	5	1	2	0	48.1%	.0	44.4%	100.0%	.0	
New York	17	37	62	26	23	9	24.0%	3.0%	7.3%	30.9%	3.7%	.0
North Carolina	42	14	5	4	2	4	28.4%	22.0%	15.2%	.0	.0	.0
North Dakota	4	3	2	2	2	1	100.0%	64.0%	.0	.0	.0	.0
Ohio	37	28	37	16	11	4	28.9%	28.1%	25.6%	10.4%	7.4%	.0
Oklahoma	0	1	0	1	0	3		.0		.0		.0
Oregon	9	11	25	7	1	1	86.0%	37.2%	28.4%	34.9%	.0	.0
Pennsylvania	129	78	18	20	24	8	45.1%	33.1%	35.5%	19.1%	11.2%	.0
Rhode Island	0	4	10	0	0	1		.0	51.1%			.0
South Carolina	1	15	2	3	1	3	100.0%	26.4%	.0	.0	.0	.0
South Dakota	1	11	5	0	1	1	100.0%	62.9%	45.5%		.0	.0
Tennessee	25	23	21	3	2	3	49.6%	41.0%	34.5%	.0	49.4%	.0
Texas	18	16	16	19	12	10	66.3%	56.8%	59.6%	34.0%	11.8%	.0
Utah	3	0	0	2	0	1	66.7%			.0		.0
Vermont	5	2	0	0	1	0	.0	100.0%			.0	
Virginia	22	12	3	7	3	2	50.4%	26.6%	54.5%	21.6%	.0	.0
Washington	18	6	28	40	3	2	39.2%	.0	42.6%	17.7%	.0	.0
West Virginia	3	3	1	1	2	1	.0	68.2%	.0	.0	21.8%	.0
Wisconsin	10	71	14	6	5	3	25.9%	25.5%	7.6%	45.5%	.8%	.0
Wyoming	4	3	2	0	0	1	76.2%	34.8%	45.5%			.0
U.S. Total	840	767	781	417	251	126	37.7%	29.9%	27.5%	18.8%	5.8%	.7%
Small cells	272	262	251	207	225	126	46.6%	36.0%	30.7%	18.3%	5.5%	.7%

Note. "Small cells" are totals for states with fewer than 25 facilities in a size category.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table A-2 continued

Group Residence Five Year Close/Move Rate: 1977-1982

State	Facilities closed/moved by size of facility					
	1-6	7-9	10-18	19-63	64-499	500+
Alabama	100.0%	60.0%		.0	25.0%	.0
Alaska	50.0%		100.0%		.0	
Arizona	60.0%	16.7%	42.9%	.0	.0	.0
Arkansas		25.0%	33.3%	.0	.0	.0
California	29.9%	[illegible]	23.4%	30.0%	12.5%	11.1%
Colorado	40.0%	17.6%	23.1%	.0	.0	.0
Connecticut	60.0%	.0	4.0%	11.1%	.0	.0
Delaware	.0	.0	.0	.0		.0
Dist. Columbia	100.0%			.0		.0
Florida	50.0%	52.4%	25.7%	46.7%	.0	.0
Georgia	25.0%	36.8%	40.0%	33.3%	.0	.0
Hawaii	42.9%			.0		.0
Idaho		.0	.0	.0	.0	
Illinois	33.3%		37.5%	25.7%	7.7%	16.7%
Indiana	16.7%	55.6%	50.0%	33.3%	.0	.0
Iowa	12.5%	16.7%	.0	18.2%	33.3%	.0
Kansas	50.0%	50.0%	36.8%	33.3%	.0	.0
Kentucky	83.3%	50.0%	100.0%	.0	.0	
Louisiana			25.0%	.0	.0	.0
Maine	33.3%		16.7%	33.3%	.0	
Maryland	33.3%	12.5%	.0	.0	.0	.0
Massachusetts	56.5%	21.2%	29.4%	10.6%	20.0%	.0
Michigan	30.6%	44.8%	38.2%	31.3%	11.1%	.0
Minnesota	2.2%	8.0%	10.2%	7.4%	12.5%	.0
Mississippi	100.0%	.0	66.7%		.0	.0
Missouri	38.3%	23.1%	47.2%	35.3%	30.0%	.0
Montana	50.0%	24.2%	25.0%	.0	.0	
Nebraska	47.4%	50.0%	11.8%	.0	.0	.0
Nevada	100.0%	100.0%		50.0%	.0	
New Hampshire	50.0%	66.7%	100.0%	.0		.0
New Jersey	25.0%	40.0%	33.3%	20.0%	.0	.0
New Mexico	61.1%	.0	60.0%	100.0%	.0	
New York	23.5%	2.7%	9.7%	24.6%	8.7%	.0
North Carolina	28.6%	21.4%	20.0%	.0	.0	.0
North Dakota	100.0%	66.7%	.0	.0	.0	.0
Ohio	29.7%	28.6%	24.3%	12.5%	9.1%	0
Oklahoma		.0		.0		.0
Oregon	88.9%	36.4%	36.0%	42.9%	.0	.0
Pennsylvania	54.3%	33.3%	38.9%	20.0%	16.7%	.0
Rhode Island		.0	50.0%			.0
South Carolina	100.0%	26.7%	.0	.0	.0	.0
South Dakota	100.0%	63.6%	40.0%		.0	.0
Tennessee	52.0%	43.5%	38.1%	.0	50.0%	.0
Texas	66.7%	56.3%	56.3%	47.4%	16.7%	.0
Utah	66.7%			.0		.0
Vermont	.0	100.0%			.0	
Virginia	50.0%	25.0%	66.7%	42.9%	.0	.0
Washington	38.9%	.0	39.3%	25.0%	.0	.0
West Virginia	.0	66.7%	.0	.0	50.0%	.0
Wisconsin	30.0%	26.8%	14.3%	50.0%	20.0%	.0
Wyoming	75.0%	33.3%	50.0%			.0
U.S. Total	41.4%	31.2%	29.4%	24.9%	9.6%	1.6%
Small cells	47.8%	36.3%	32.2%	23.7%	9.8%	1.6%

Note. "Small cells" are totals for states with fewer than 25 facilities in a size category.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table A-3

Staffed Semi-independent Living Facility Close/Move Rate: 1977-1982

State	Number of facilities studied by size of facility				Beds closed/moved by size of facility				Facilities closed/moved by size of facility			
	1-3	4-7	8-12	13+	1-3	4-7	8-12	13+	1-3	4-7	8-12	13+
Alabama	0	0	0	0								
Alaska	0	0	0	0								
Arizona	0	0	1	0			.0				.0	
Arkansas	0	0	2	0			.0				.0	
California	0	0	0	4				.0				.0
Colorado	2	7	6	1	50.0%	83.3%	85.5%	100.0%	50.0%	85.7%	83.3%	100.0%
Connecticut	0	1	1	4		100.0%	.0	45.7%		100.0%	.0	50.9%
Delaware	0	0	0	0								
Dist. Columbia	0	0	0	0								
Florida	0	0	1	3			.0	38.5%			.0	33.3%
Georgia	0	0	0	0								
Hawaii	0	0	0	0								
Idaho	0	0	0	0		.0				.0		
Illinois	0	0	0	0								
Indiana	0	2	3	1		100.0%	70.4%	100.0%		100.0%	66.7%	100.0%
Iowa	0	0	1	0			100.0%				100.0%	
Kansas	0	1	1	0		.0	.0			.0	.0	
Kentucky	0	0	0	0								
Louisiana	0	0	0	0								
Maine	0	0	0	0								
Maryland	5	0	0	0	100.0%				100.0%			
Massachusetts	0	4	2	6		77.3%	52.6%	64.6%		75.0%	50.0%	66.7%
Michigan	0	0	1	0			.0				.0	
Minnesota	0	1	1	3		.0	.0	51.9%		.0	.0	33.3%
Mississippi	0	0	0	0								
Missouri	0	1	0	0		.0				.0		
Montana	0	0	0	1				100.0%				100.0%
Nebraska	2	0	1	0	100.0%		100.0%		100.0%		100.0%	
Nevada	0	1	0	0		100.0%				100.0%		
New Hampshire	0	0	0	0								
New Jersey	0	0	0	1				.0				.0
New Mexico	0	0	1	0			.0				.0	
New York	1	2	3	1	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0
North Carolina	0	0	0	0								
North Dakota	0	0	0	0								
Ohio	0	2	1	0		41.7%	100.0%			50.0%	100.0%	
Oklahoma	0	0	0	0								
Oregon	0	0	0	0								
Pennsylvania	13	6	7	3	88.0%	69.2%	54.7%	68.4%	92.3%	66.7%	57.1%	66.7%
Rhode Island	0	0	0	0								
South Carolina	3	0	0	0	100.0%				100.0%			
South Dakota	2	0	0	0	100.0%				100.0%			
Tennessee	0	1	2	1		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Texas	0	1	0	2		.0		.0		.0		.0
Utah	0	0	0	0								
Vermont	0	0	0	0								
Virginia	4	0	0	0	100.0%				100.0%			
Washington	0	1	0	1		.0		.0		.0		.0
West Virginia	1	1	0	0	100.0%	.0			100.0%	.0		
Wisconsin	1	1	0	0	100.7%	.0			100.0%	.0		
Wyoming	0	0	0	0								
Small cells	34	34	36	32	87.8%	55.1%	48.5%	39.6%	91.2%	55.9%	50.0%	43.8%

Note. "Small cells" are totals for states with fewer than 25 facilities in a size category.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table A-4

Board & Room Facility Five Year Close/Move Rate: 1977-1982

State	Number of facilities studied by size of facility				Beds closed/moved by size of facility				Facilities closed/moved by size of facility			
	1-5	6-10	11-19	20+	1-5	6-10	11-19	20+	1-5	6-10	11-19	20+
Alabama	0	0	0	0								
Alaska	0	0	0	0								
Arizona	0	0	0	0								
Arkansas	0	0	0	0								
California	6	6	2	4	81.8%	20.8%	6.7%	70.0%	83.3%	33.3%	50.0%	75.0%
Colorado	0	0	0	0								
Connecticut	1	0	0	0	.0				.0			
Delaware	0	0	0	0								
Dist. Columbia	0	0	0	R								
Florida	1	0	0	1	.0			.0	.0			.0
Georgia	0	1	0	0		.0				.0		
Hawaii	5	1	0	0	18.2%	100.0%			40.0%	100.0%		
Idaho	0	0	0	0								
Illinois	1	2	2	3	100.0%	50.0%	91.7%	32.4%	100.0%	50.0%	50.0%	33.3%
Indiana	0	0	0	0								
Iowa	0	0	0	0								
Kansas	1	1	5	0	.0	.0	9.7%		.0	.0	20.0%	
Kentucky	0	0	0	0								
Louisiana	0	0	0	0								
Maine	1	9	2	5	.0	32.7%	50.0%	33.0%	.0	33.3%	50.0%	40.0%
Maryland	0	0	0	0								
Massachusetts	0	0	0	0								
Michigan	1	1	2	0	.0	.0	.0		.0	.0	.0	
Minnesota	0	0	0	0								
Mississippi	0	0	0	0								
Missouri	3	2	3	3	55.6%	28.6%	.0	25.9%	33.3%	50.0%	.0	66.7%
Montana	0	0	0	1				.0				.0
Nebraska	0	0	0	0								
Nevada	0	0	0	0								
New Hampshire	0	0	0	0								
New Jersey	2	0	6	3	.0		20.0%	94.1%	.0		33.3%	66.7%
New Mexico	0	0	0	0								
New York	2	0	0	0	.0				.0			
North Carolina	0	0	0	0								
North Dakota	0	0	0	0								
Ohio	2	0	0	0	50.0%				50.0%			
Oklahoma	0	0	0	0								
Oregon	0	0	0	2				.0				.0
Pennsylvania	0	1	0	0		.0				.0		
Rhode Island	0	0	0	0								
South Carolina	0	0	0	0								
South Dakota	0	0	0	0								
Tennessee	0	0	0	0								
Texas	0	0	0	0								
Utah	0	0	1	0			.0				.0	
Vermont	0	1	2	0		100.0%	20.0%			100.0%	50.0%	
Virginia	0	0	0	0								
Washington	0	3	2	5		36.4%	100.0%	60.7%		33.3%	100.0%	80.0%
West Virginia	0	0	0	0								
Wisconsin	0	0	0	0								
Wyoming	0	0	0	0								
Small cells	26	28	27	27	33.3%	28.7%	21.7%	46.5%	38.5%	35.7%	33.3%	51.9%

Note. "Small cells" are totals for states with fewer than 25 facilities in a size category.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table A-5

Personal Care Home Five Year Close/Move Rate: 1977-1982

State	Number of facilities studied by size of facility				Beds closed/moved by size of facility				Facilities closed/moved by size of facility			
	1-4	5-11	12-23	24+	1-4	5-11	12-23	24+	1-4	5-11	12-23	24+
Alabama	0	0	0	0								
Alaska	0	0	0	0								
Arizona	0	0	0	0								
Arkansas	0	0	0	0								
California	22	24	5	2	50.9%	29.7%	36.7%	.0	50.0%	29.2%	40.0%	.0
Colorado	0	0	0	0								
Connecticut	0	0	0	1				.0				.0
Delaware	0	0	0	0								
Dist. Columbia	0	0	0	0								
Florida	0	4	1	1		.0	.0	.0		.0	.0	.0
Georgia	0	0	0	0								
Hawaii	22	0	1	0	.0		.0		.0		.0	
Idaho	1	2	1	3	100.0%	100.0%	.0	.0	100.0%	100.0%	.0	.0
Illinois	0	2	20	35		43.8%	58.8%	61.8%		50.0%	65.0%	65.7%
Indiana	0	0	0	1				.0				.0
Iowa	0	0	0	1				.0				.0
Kansas	1	1	1	1	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Kentucky	0	0	0	0								
Louisiana	0	0	0	0								
Maine	0	4	1	0		18.2%	.0			25.0%	.0	
Maryland	0	0	0	0								
Massachusetts	0	0	0	0								
Michigan	1	20	30	10	.0	15.1%	10.0%	26.3%	.0	10.0%	10.0%	20.0%
Minnesota	0	0	0	1				.0				.0
Mississippi	0	0	0	0								
Missouri	1	6	4	3	.0	74.5%	42.5%	60.0%	.0	66.7%	50.0%	66.7%
Montana	0	1	0	0		.0				.0		
Nebraska	0	0	0	0								
Nevada	0	0	0	0								
New Hampshire	0	1	1	0		.0	.0			.0	.0	
New Jersey	6	1	12	10	38.5%	100.0%	72.7%	13.9%	33.3%	100.0%	41.7%	20.0%
New Mexico	0	0	0	0								
New York	8	6	0	0	.0	.0			.0	.0		
North Carolina	0	2	1	0		.0	.0			.0	.0	
North Dakota	0	0	0	0								
Ohio	1	0	0	2	.0			.0	.0			.0
Oklahoma	0	0	0	0								
Oregon	0	2	1	0		.0	.0			.0	.0	
Pennsylvania	7	0	0	1	100.0%			.0	100.0%			.0
Rhode Island	0	0	0	0								
South Carolina	0	0	0	0								
South Dakota	0	0	0	0								
Tennessee	0	0	0	0								
Texas	0	0	0	0								
Utah	1	0	2	0	.0		66.7%		.0		50.0%	
Vermont	11	7	0	0	42.4%	33.3%			36.4%	42.9%		
Virginia	0	0	0	0								
Washington	0	0	4	6			65.9%	72.7%			75.0%	66.7%
West Virginia	0	0	0	0								
Wisconsin	0	1	0	1		.0		.0		.0		.0
Wyoming	0	0	0	0								
U.S. Total	82	84	85	79	31.3%	26.7%	38.0%	35.8%	31.7%	26.2%	35.3%	43.0%
Small cells	82	84	55	44	31.3%	26.7%	51.3%	15.1%	31.7%	26.2%	49.1%	25.0%

Note. "Small cells" are totals for states with fewer than 25 facilities in a size category.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table A-6

Specialized Nursing Facility Five Year Close/Move Rate:1977-1982

State	Number of facilities studied by size of facility				Beds closed/moved by size of facility				Facilities closed/moved by size of facility			
	1-29	30-52	53-100	101+	1-29	30-52	53-100	101+	1-29	30-52	53-100	101+
Alabama	0	1	0	1		.0		.0		.0		.0
Alaska	0	0	0	0								
Arizona	0	2	0	0		51.9%				50.0%		
Arkansas	1	1	0	0	.0	.0			.0	.0		
California	1	0	5	2	100.0%		14.8%	.0	100.0%		20.0%	.0
Colorado	0	0	0	0			.0				.0	
Connecticut	0	0	1	0								
Delaware	0	0	0	0		100.0%				100.0%		
Dist. Columbia	0	0	0	0			.0				.0	
Florida	0	1	0	0		100.0%						
Georgia	0	0	1	0								
Hawaii	0	0	0	0			.0				.0	
Idaho	0	0	0	0								
Illinois	0	6	5	5		18.8%	22.1%	.0		16.7%	20.0%	.0
Indiana	0	1	0	0		.0				.0		
Iowa	0	0	0	0								
Kansas	0	1	0	0		.0				.0		
Kentucky	1	0	0	0	.0				.0			
Louisiana	0	0	0	0								
Maine	2	1	0	0	.0	.0			.0	.0		
Maryland	0	0	0	0								
Massachusetts	0	0	0	0								
Michigan	0	0	0	0								
Minnesota	2	0	0	2	.0			.0	.0			.0
Mississippi	0	1	0	0		100.0%				100.0%		
Missouri	2	1	1	3	64.3%	.0	.0	73.0%	50.0%	.0	.0	33.3%
Montana	0	0	0	0								
Nebraska	1	0	0	0	.0				.0			
Nevada	1	0	0	0	.0				.0			
New Hampshire	0	0	0	0								
New Jersey	1	0	0	0	.0				.0			
New Mexico	0	0	0	0								
New York	2	0	0	1	.0			.0	.0			.0
North Carolina	0	0	1	0			.0				.0	
North Dakota	0	0	0	0								
Ohio	3	1	0	2	72.0%	11.2%		.0	66.7%	33.3%		.0
Oklahoma	0	0	0	4				.0				.0
Oregon	0	1	2	0		100.0%	.0			100.0%	.0	
Pennsylvania	2	1	2	1	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0
Rhode Island	0	0	0	0								
South Carolina	0	0	0	0								
South Dakota	0	0	0	0								
Tennessee	0	1	1	0		100.0%	.0			100.0%	.0	
Texas	2	0	0	0	.0				.0			
Utah	1	1	3	0	.0	.0	59.9%		.0	.0	66.7%	
Vermont	0	0	0	0								
Virginia	0	0	0	0								
Washington	0	1	0	1		.0		100.0%		.0		100.0%
West Virginia	0	0	0	0								
Wisconsin	0	0	0	1				.0				.0
Wyoming	0	0	0	0								
Small cells	22	24	22	23	12.7%	27.8%	17.7%	6.5%	18.2%	29.2%	18.2%	8.7%

Note. "Small cells" are totals for states with fewer than 25 facilities in a size category.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE